



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,031	08/18/2003	Raymond Robert Patch	MSFT-1956/303857.1	3222
41505	7590	12/28/2007		
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER VAUGHN, GREGORY J	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,031

Applicant(s)

PATCH ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory J. Vaughn

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 21-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 21-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Application Background

1. This action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination, filed on 10/31/2007.
2. Applicant has amended claim 18, and canceled claims 19 and 20.
3. Claims 1-18 and 21-28 are pending in the case; claims 1, 10, 18 and 21 are independent claims.
4. A request for continued examination filed under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after a final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office Action (dated 10/17/2007) has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.
5. The examiner's rejection of claims 19 and 20, rejected under 35 USC 102, as recited in the previous office action (dated 10/17/2007) are withdrawn in view of the canceled claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States."

7. Claims 1-18 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elmore et al., US Patent Publication 2006/0059107, filed 3/30/2001, published 3/16/2006 (hereinafter Elmore).

8. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Elmore discloses validating markup language text. Elmore discloses his invention as an e-business online commerce solution (see paragraph 4), where the online solution is provided using markup language (see paragraphs 38, 39, 66, 69, 103, 104 106 etc. for examples of how the invention is implemented using HTML and XML). Elmore discloses validating the markup text. Elmore recites: *"The interconnect service EJB provides an interface that the activity smart components use to access external systems 110. Messages that contain information for external systems 110 are sent from the eBusiness support system through a particular type of communications messaging interface (CMI) 105. Examples of these CMI types include credit card validation, address validation, and service reservation, etc"* (paragraph 65).

Markup language documents are processed by parsing the document elements in an order prescribed by the markup. Elmore discloses validating the document elements as the parser encounters each element by using a validation table and a validation delegate. Elmore recites: *"The server then parses through the data and looks in the TRANS_MAP table to determine if there is a transition policy associated with the "from" and "task" directives. If a transition policy does not exist, the user is directed to the page set in the "to" directive. If a transition policy exists, the policy is invoked and the server executes the navigation logic defined in the policy."* (paragraph 115). As described above, Elmore discloses a validation delegate that corresponds to the document element (in this example the *"transition policy"* is the delegate). Furthermore, this passage from Elmore indicates that multiple elements (first, second and so on) will be encountered and validated as indicated by the markup associated with each element.

Elmore discloses the use of validation delegates. Elmore recites: *"Integration Layer 102, through which Smart Components 104 access external systems 110. The interconnect service within this layer uses communications messaging interfaces (CMIs) 105 and adapters 106/107 to transport messages. The CMIs are pre-defined interfaces to common services (e.g. rating, address validation, service reservation, etc.) needed to complete client requests for customer, pre-order, order, and post order transactions. The EAI Adapters 106 provide the flexibility to integrate with an EAI package 109. These adapters are configurable software interfaces for*

different EAI packages, such as Vitria BusinessWare or BEA eLink. Other adapters are also available" (paragraph 37).

Elmore discloses validation tables in the form of libraries. Elmore recites: *"JavaScript Libraries. The JavaScript libraries are used for client-side validation. js_validation.js provides JavaScript methods for validating data to submit to the server. For example, it is used to verify that the required fields are filled in by the user. Client-side validation should be used in conjunction with server-side validation. The former is not a replacement for the later. Although client-side validation may enable a better user experience by performing validation on the fly, it exposes the application to security risks from users who could bypass the JavaScript and submit erroneous data to the database. The JavaScript libraries are also used for input and form submit manipulation. js_common.js provides javaScript methods for setting request parameters and passing variables and values to the server" (paragraphs 125-127).*

Elmore discloses validation in the form of lookup tables that are outside of schema. These lookup tables provide validation beyond the validation normally associated with the markup language embodiment of the claimed invention. The syntax rules for markup language varies (HTML is less restrictive, while XML is more restrictive), however a valid markup language document may still be invalid (applicant's originally filed specification at paragraph 40 provides an example in the form of a street address). Elmore

discloses this kind of validation. See paragraphs 37 and 65, where Elmore discloses validation of street address

Elmore discloses validating text by using validation delegates and validation tables, as described above. Elmore discloses a plurality of elements, related to each other in a tree representation, where there exist roots and subtrees of elements in figure 12.

9. **Regarding dependent claims 2, 3, 6 and 9**, Elmore discloses determining if a validation table contains no validation delegates (claim 2), identifying and executing a third validation delegate (claim 3), making a validation decision (claim 6) and validating text (claim 9). Elmore discloses Business Rule Adapters in Figure 1 at reference sign 107. Business rule adapters specify the determining, identifying, decision-making and validating required for the specific business problem being solved.
10. **Regarding dependent claims 4 and 7**, Elmore disclose the use of flags to implement the business logic of the ecommerce interface – see paragraphs 72, 87 and 89 for some examples).
11. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Elmore discloses a plurality of validation tables, as described above (described as a plurality of libraries).
12. **Regarding dependent claim 8**, Elmore discloses the delegates as interpretable code – see the code listing after paragraph 64.

13. **Regarding claims 10-18 and 21-28**, the claims are directed toward a method, system and computer readable media for the computer-readable medium of claims 1-9, and are rejected using the same rationale. Claim 26 is further directed toward *"where the mapping information can be modified to cause the same validation engine, without modification, to modify which executable validation delegates the validation engine selects for which corresponding element type"*. Elmore discloses a connection with external systems that allow the mapping information to be modified to cause the same validation engine, without modification, to modify the validation delegates. Elmore recites: *"The interconnect service EJB provides an interface that the activity smart components use to access external systems 110. Messages that contain information for external systems 110 are sent from the eBusiness support system through a particular type of communications messaging interface (CMI) 105. Examples of these CMI types include credit card validation, address validation, and service reservation, etc"* (paragraph 65).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
15. **Regarding independent claim 1**, applicant argues that the prior art does not disclose the claimed validation (page 10 to page 12, of the response filed 10/31/2007). Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1, as described above. Elmore discloses encountering first and second elements of the plurality of document elements. Markup language documents are processed by parsing the document elements in an order prescribed by the markup. Elmore discloses validating the document elements as the parser encounters each element by using a validation table and a validation delegate. Elmore recites: *"The server then parses through the data and looks in the TRANS_MAP table to determine if there is a transition policy associated with the "from" and "task" directives. If a transition policy does not exist, the user is directed to the page set in the "to" directive. If a transition policy exists, the policy is invoked and the server executes the navigation logic defined in the policy."* (paragraph 115). As described above, Elmore discloses a validation delegate that corresponds to the document element (in this example the *"transition policy"* is the delegate). Furthermore, this passage from Elmore indicates that multiple elements (first, second and so on) will be encountered and validated as indicated by the markup associated with each element.

16. **Also, regarding claim 1**, applicant argues that Figure 12 fails to disclose “encountering a second element that is a root of a subtree of said first element” (page 11, last paragraph of the response filed 10/31/2007). Figure 12 of Elmore is a block diagram showing a pricing model for one offer with two price groups, which is an example of a document element that has subtree, and where the subtree has a root. For instance, one of the elements is "Price 1". This element has 2 subtrees. The root of one of the subtrees is "Price Arrangement 1". AS described above, these elements are validated as required by the markup, and using validation tables to identify validation delegates.

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Vaughn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4131. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached at (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Gregory J. Vaughn/
Patent Examiner
December 19, 2007


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER